DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 096 806 EC 070 193

TITLE	Children Without Labels: ESEA Title III Project 1232; "Handicapped Children in the Regular Classroom".
INSTITUTION	Fountain Valley School District, Calif.
NOTE	67p.; For related documents, see EC 070 191 and EC 070 192
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$3.15 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; *Educable Mentally Handicapped; *Exceptional Child Education; Handicapped Children; *Learning Disabilities; Program Descriptions; *Program Evaluation; *Regular Class Placement; School Districts; Self Concept; State Programs; Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS	California; Elementary Secondary Education Act Title III; ESEA Title III

ABSTRACT

Described is a project in which 60 educable mentally handicapped (EMH) and 30 educationally Handicapped (EH) students were placed in regular classes and provided with individually prescribed programs based on daily assessment and prescription by a resource teacher. Information is provided on the California school district implementing the project and on such aspects of the program as its scope, personnel, organization, services, instructional equipment and materials, budget, parent-community involvement, and evaluation. It is explained that pre- and posttest measures were given to assess the project objectives concerned with pupils' growth in academic achievement, acceptance by regular classroom teachers and students, and self-concept. Data are reported to show that EMR students made an average of 9 months growth in reading and 12 months growth in mathematics, that EH students achieved an average of 11 months growth in reading and 12 months growth in mathematics, that there was no difference in the teachers' overall perception of handicapped versus nonhandicapped students as measured by Osgood's Semantic Differential, and that the majority of students reached criterion levels of self-concept as measured by the Stick Figure Test and the Auditory Self-Concept Measuring Instrument. (GW)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CHILDREN

WITHOUT LABELS

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

E.S.E.A. Title III Project 1232

"Handicapped Children in the Regular Classroom"

Fountain Valley School District
Number One Lighthouse Lane
Fountain Valley, California 92708

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. PROJECT ABSTRACT iii

II. PROJECT NARRATIVE 1

The Locale 1

The School System 2

Historical Background 2

Program 3

Scope of the Program 3

Personnel. 5

Organizational Details 5

Activities or Services 6

Instructional Equipment and Materials. 7

Budget 10

Parent-Community Involvement 12

Special Factors. 13

Evaluation 14

Choosing Participants. 14

Describing Participants. 14

Measuring Changes. 15

Presenting Data. 16

Analyzing Data 16

Major Project Goal 18

Project Objectives and Findings. 18

III. APPENDIX 26

Objective 1.0 - Tables #1 - #7 26

Objective 2.0 - Tables #8 and #9 33

Objective 3.0 - Tables #10 - #23, also #7. 43

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

IV. FIGURES

#1 - Differences in Mean Expected Grade Equivalent Scores for EMR and EH Students in Reading and Arithmetic During a Three Year Period 17

#2 - Expected and Actual Grade Equivalent Increases (GEI) for EMR and EH Students in Reading and Arithmetic 20

#3 - Number of Students Elected to Class Offices at Fulton School 23

V. INDIVIDUAL CASE DATA 57

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PROJECT ABSTRACT
"HANDICAPPED CHILDREN IN THE REGULAR CLASSROOM"
PROJECT NUMBER 0135
FOUNTAIN VALLEY SCHOOL DISTRICT

Project Goal:

The purpose of this project was to establish an innovative, educational plan whereby the total district population of EMR and EH students could be effectively educated in the regular classroom as determined by improvement in reading, mathematics, student and teacher acceptance and self-concept.

Program Procedures and Activities:

The sixty EMR and thirty EH students in the project were initially assessed by a comprehensive psychoeducational evaluation. Students were provided with individually prescribed programs based on daily assessment and prescription by a resource teacher. The resource teacher worked with regular classroom teachers in order to coordinate each pupil's program with regular class activities. The regular classroom teacher was responsible for helping the handicapped students to feel that they were valuable members of the classroom utilizing group discussions or group awareness activities.

Objectives and Evaluation:

Pre and post test measures were given to assess the project objectives concerned with the pupils' growth in (1) academic achievement, (2) their acceptance by regular classroom students and teachers, and (3) their growth and self-concept.

Accomplishments:

At year's end, all objectives met or exceeded the criterion levels. Project students falling within the EMR intellectual range made an average of nine months growth in reading and twelve months growth in mathematics. The EH students made an average of eleven months growth in reading and twelve months growth in mathematics. High teacher acceptance was reported at the beginning and end of the school year for both handicapped and non-handicapped students. There was no difference in the teachers' over-all perception of handicapped versus the non-handicapped students as measured by the evaluative scale on Osgood's Semantic Differential.

In self-concept using the Stick Figure Test, 96% of the EMR and 100% of the EH students reached criterion level. Using the Auditory Self-Concept Measuring Instrument, 77% of the EMR students and 86% of the EH students reached criterion level.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE LOCALE

The Fountain Valley School District is located in Western Orange County and serves the communities of Fountain Valley and Huntington Beach. Fifty thousand people live in the nine square miles of the City of Fountain Valley, 95% of which own their own homes and have moved from adjacent areas. Thirty-six percent of the husbands in Fountain Valley have completed four or more years of college, 31% have completed from one to three years of college and 25% are high school graduates. In addition, 14% of the wives in the community have completed four or more years of college, 31% have completed from one to three years of college and 47% are high school graduates. According to a 1967 survey, 52% of the families living in Fountain Valley make from $10,000 to $15,000 per year, and 28% have incomes greater than $15,000 per year. Also, 7.8% of the families in the Fountain Valley area come from ethnic backgrounds including American Indian, Spanish surnames, Orientals and other minorities. Most of the families in Fountain Valley are employed in adjacent areas outside of the community. Nearly 50% of the husbands are in engineering, administrative or sales fields, while one-third of the wives work in secretarial, clerical, educational, medical health or sales. The unemployment rate in Fountain Valley, as of the 1970 census, was 5.6% which is highly influenced by current trends in the aerospace industry. Presently, there are approximately 360 families in the area receiving Welfare assistance. Although the Fountain Valley population is a relatively young group, the birth rates have been decreasing. This trend is consistent with the national averages. The area is presently 70% developed, and the remaining 30% to be developed will be mostly residential area comprised of both single and multiple housing units.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE SCHOOL SYSTEM

The Fountain Valley School District encompasses 17 schools serving 11,000 students, grades K through 8. The District has grown from one to 17 schools in approximately ten years. The trend appears to be for a continuous increase in population for the next several years. The anticipated increase for enrollment during the 1972-73 school year is 3 percent. The current expense per pupil cost for the previous fiscal period was $680.97 per ADA. The District derives its income from Federal, State, County and Local levels.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Prior to the introduction of the E.S.E.A. Title III Project, "Handicapped Children in the Regular Classroom," special classes existed for the education of Educable Mentally Retarded students and Educationally Handicapped students. Programs for the Educationally Handicapped were housed at each of the schools in the district. The Educable Mentally Retarded students were bussed to two centrally located schools where four classes were housed, two at each school.

Parents, teachers and administrators were concerned by poor academic progress as well as poor adaptive behavior manifested by the students in our special education programs. The Educable Mentally Retarded students made on the average of three months academic growth during the school year, while the Educationally Handicapped students obtained a mean growth of approximately four months. There was little acceptance of the handicapped students by their non-handicapped peers. In June, 1969, Special Education teachers, regular classroom teachers and parents were consulted regarding alternative approaches to Special Education. From these meetings, a new model emerged. This model was implemented in the fall.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In September, 1969, the Educable Mentally Retarded and Educationally Handicapped students at Fulton School were placed in regular classes with specialized services provided by special education resource personnel. In February of the same academic year, approximately one-half of the handicapped students at Gisler School were placed in regular classes with specialized resource help made available to these students. The other one-half of the students remained in a readiness program housed in self-contained classes at Gisler School. As the students became "ready," as determined by their acquisition of certain behavioral traits considered by the project staff to be essential for successful integration into the regular classroom program, they were integrated. All but two students were integrated at the termination of the 1969-70 school year. In September, 1970, the entire district-wide handicapped population was integrated into the regular classroom. Each school had a special education resource teacher for the Educationally Handicapped. The more severely handicapped were brought to the two project schools which had more resource services available to serve these children. During the 1972-73 school year, four schools established as supplementary education centers were modeled after the two project schools. They provide services for the more severely handicapped children who could not be helped at their neighborhood schools. Private schools and community agencies were invited to participate in planning and continuous evaluation.

PROGRAM

Scope of the Program

Project Number 0135, "Handicapped Children in the Regular Classroom," served the total district population of students enrolled in the program for the Educable Mentally Retarded and the Educationally Handicapped students at Fulton and Gisler Schools. The program indirectly served all handicapped

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

children in the district. For instance, educationally handicapped students, visually handicapped students, speech and language impaired students, aphasic and multi-handicapped students were served by in-service presentations, materials and other appropriate placements for these students.

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS IN PROGRAM BY HANDICAP

*Educable Mentally Retarded	56
*Educationally Handicapped (at Fulton and Gisler Schools)	26
Educationally Handicapped (at remaining schools)	172
Visually Handicapped (total district)	5
Speech and Language Impaired (total district)	630
Aphasic	6
Multi-Handicapped	12

*Officially in program

The following objectives were developed for the students attending the two project schools, Fulton and Gisler:

1.0 Improvement in academic performance will be demonstrated if the students perform at or above their grade level expectancies as determined by September test scores on the Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT) in reading and mathematics; and 75% of the students demonstrate at least 75% mastery of the subject matter presented during the school year as measured by project-developed criterion tests.

2.0 Project students will be accepted by classroom teachers in May as well or better than they were in September as measured by teacher ratings on bi-polar adjectives from the evaluative scale of the Semantic Differential; and project students will be accepted by regular classroom students in May as well or better than they were in September as measured by the number of votes received for class offices.

3.0 Improvement in self-concept will be demonstrated if 75% of the project students score the same or higher in May than they did in September on the Stick Figure Test and if 75% of the project students score the same or higher in May than they did in September on the auditory self-concept measuring instrument (ASCMI) and on their measured level of aspiration.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Personnel

The following personnel were added as a result of the project: one Prescriptive Resource Teacher, one half-time Psychologist, one half-time Growth and Developmental Specialist, and one full-time Language Specialist. The role of the Prescriptive Teacher was as a resource teacher. This person worked on the development of new curriculum and as a consultant to the regular classroom and other special education teachers. She also provided instruction directly to pupils assigned her. The half-time Psychologist provided necessary data for the identification and placement of pupils. He also provided counseling and consulting services for pupils, parents and teachers. The Growth and Developmental Specialist gathered developmental information as well as screening data in the areas of vision, hearing and dental. She also provided specialized followup for the handicapped pupils after the Drug Education and Family Life presentations and made information available to families for referrals for medical or social assistance. The Speech and Language Specialist provided services involving assessment, diagnosis, prescription and remediation of speech and language difficulties for the handicapped children involved in the Program.

Organizational Details

"Handicapped Children in the Regular Classroom" was located at Fulton and Gisler Schools. Fulton and Gisler Schools are both open space schools which have classrooms adjacent to learning centers. The learning centers are staffed by Learning Coordinators, Parent Aides and Special Education Resource Personnel. The Learning Coordinators work with students who are not served by other special programs, such as those students in need of remedial reading or remedial mathematics as well as mentally gifted students. The Special Education Resource Personnel work with students who have previously been categorized as Educable Mentally Retarded or Educationally Handicapped. The handicapped

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

pupils were provided with individual contracts; they would be seen daily for periods from thirty minutes to two hours by the various learning center staff such as Resource Teachers, Speech and Language Specialists and Learning Coordinators. Systematic reviews of each pupil's progress were made during weekly modified day staffings. During these staffings, it was decided whether or not the pupil would need additional services beyond what he was already receiving, or whether or not he would need fewer services. In-service training was provided for Special Education Resource Personnel as well as for regular classroom teachers throughout the district. The in-service presentations typically presented new strategies for teaching handicapped children, as well as introducing teachers and other staff to new materials and techniques available in the field.

Activities or Services

Pupils were seen daily by Special Education Resource Personnel. After morning activities in the regular classroom, the students would be scheduled into the Learning Center to see the Resource Specialist where daily individual contracts were developed. The Resource Teacher would develop new concepts with the child until she was sure that he could manage the activity independently. As the pupil completed each activity of the daily contract, he could check off that activity. After completing an agreed-upon number of activities, the pupil could choose some free time activity in the Learning Center or in a classroom interest center. After checking with his regular classroom teacher, the handicapped child would once again be scheduled into the Learning Center to work with the Special Education Resource Teacher. The Resource Teacher would go over his assignment with him and give him immediate feedback of results as to how the child had done on his assignment. Each week the child could bring

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

home samples of his completed classroom work to review with his parents. Behavior management systems varied with the child. Some children were at a level where they needed concrete rewards for the completion of tasks, while other children could earn free time activities or the completion of the task alone was rewarding enough. Each of the Resource Teachers at the Project Schools worked with from ten to twelve different students daily. When the Resource Teachers individually conferenced with the child, they typically worked with from two to four different children for each conference period. At time, larger group activities were offered to help the handicapped child learn to participate effectively in larger group settings. Positive reinforcement was perhaps the most useful tool for motivating the students. Regular classroom teachers were trained also to focus in on the positive behaviors in the classroom and to ignore those behaviors which they wished to eliminate.

Instructional Equipment and Materials

Project students were provided with both teacher developed and commercial programs. The following commercial programs have been utilized by the project for the past three years.

Hoffman Reading Program

Description

The Hoffman Reader provides supplemental instruction in the development of reading skills. It has a series of sequential programs presented in a nighly attractive style. Up to six students may view and listen to the program at one time. They are provided with worksheets and booklets and are allowed to proceed through each lesson at their own rate. They are also able to chart their own progress as they move through the program.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Evaluation

The Hoffman Program has been utilized by a majority of the project students during this past budget period. The rate at which they proceed through each program is highly dependent upon the frequency of use of the program and the general intellectual level of the student. Educable mentally retarded students proceed at a much slower rate than educationally handicapped or "normal" students. Students generally enjoy working on the Hoffman Reader and are able to acquire the presented reading skills if they are provided with appropriate follow-up by the resource teachers. It should, therefore, not be considered a total reading program, but rather a supplemental reading program which can help motivate students to become interested in reading.

Recommendation

Though not essential for the operation of this project, the Hoffman Reader has proved to be a useful and attractive adjunct to the program.

Symbol Accentuation Program

Description

The Symbol Accentuation Program is designed primarily for non-readers who have been unsuccessful with the traditional phonetic approach to reading. It is not an auto-instructional program, but requires full involvement on the part of the teacher. What it attempts to do is bridge the gap between the symbolic reference and its word symbol. For example, a picture of a window (the referent) transforms into the word window (the symbol) by the use of a Super-8 film loop. It is presented in three phases and gradually helps the students gain phonetic word attack skills.

Evaluation

This year we have only identified ten students (from the Educationally Handicapped Program at two different non-project schools) who have not been able

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

to learn to read by the traditional phonetic approach. These students have had tremendous success with the first two phases of the Symbol Accentuation Program. They are presently entering the third phase and are experiencing some difficulty in acquiring the sound-blending skills presently being introduced to them.

Recommendations

This program has proven to be an important resource for our teachers when they experience the problem of working with students who cannot grasp the phonetic skills presented in a traditional fashion.

Language Master

Description

One of the most versatile of the audio-visual aids used in our program is the Language Master. It offers pre-packaged commercial educational programs, or the teacher may prepare her own programs on blank cards. The machines allow the subject to see and hear a correct response, record his own response, and compare his response to the correct response. Its operation is simple enough so even our most handicapped students can readily learn to use it.

Evaluation

Our resource teachers have kept daily records on the frequency of use of all of our commercial programs. The Language Master turns out to be the most frequently used of all the programs. When asked to rate our programs in terms of their ability to meet individual student needs, the teachers rated Language Master the highest.

Recommendation

It is highly recommended that Language Master Programs be considered by anyone interested in establishing an integrated special education program for it is so adaptable to a variety of individual needs.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In addition to the above materials, the resource teachers developed their own sequential math program and files for social studies, science and reading activities.

Budget

Income for this program was derived from two different sources: ESEA Title III in the amount of $61,796.00, and from Special Education funds in the amount of $13,890.00 per each Educable Mentally Retarded Class and $1,011.00 per A.D.A. for each Educationally Handicapped Student. The total cost of the program over a period of three years was $301,425.00 as shown below:

Educable Mentally Retarded for 3 years	$178,989
Learning Disabilities Grouping for 3 years	55,560
Educationally Handicapped for 3 years	39,096
Transitional Class for 2 years	27,780
	$301,425

The developmental, implementation and operational costs per pupil which are detailed below were derived from the formula of the total developmental, implementation or operational costs divided by the total number of pupils participating in the program:

PER PUPIL COST DETAIL

ESEA TITLE III
PROJECT 0135

Budget Period: 7/1/71 - 6/30/72

Number of pupils to be directly involved in the project:

EMR - 55

EH - 30

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Developmental costs:

Coordinator	$14,251	
Prescriptive Teacher	12,778	
Secretary	8,021	
Clerk	2,573	
Evaluation Consultant	1,000	
Growth & Dev. Specialist	5,207	(1/2 time)
Fixed Charges	3,435	
TOTAL	$47,265	

Developmental costs per pupil:

$556

Implementation costs:

Capital Outlay (the following items were obtained over 3 yrs. on a lease/purchase basis):

Stenorette
Office Chair
IBM Typewriter
4-Drawer File w/Lock
Tape Recorder
Language Master
Language Master Programs
Hoffman Reader & Programs
Symbol Accentuation Program
(including two projectors)

Total cost of the above items	-	$ 7,584
(Cost for 71-72 budget period	-	2,400)
1/2 time Coordinator	-	7,500
1/2 time Clerk	-	2,573
TOTAL		$17,657

Implementation costs per pupil:

$207

Operational costs: *

2 EH LDG Programs	$ 45,120	(at the rate of 1,880/ada)
4 EMR (Resource Teachers)	55,560	(at the rate of 13,890 per class)
1 Transitional (Supplemental Teacher)	13,890	
1/2 time Coordinator	7,500	
1/2 time Secretary	3,838	
1/2 time Growth & Dev. Specialist	5,207	
1/2 time Psychologist	6,000	
Fixed Charges	3,435	
TOTAL	$140,550	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Operational costs per pupil: **

$1,653.52

*Operational costs are based on current estimates of state reimbursement for EMR classes and EH LDG programs.

**Per pupil costs are based on a maximum ADA authorized by the Education Code.

The normal per pupil cost for non-handicapped pupils in the school district is $680.97 compared to $1,654.00 per pupil for handicapped children involved in this program. More detailed budget information may be obtained from the financial report which can be obtained from the State Department of Education ESEA Title III Office after September, 1972.

Parent-Community Involvement

Parents have been actively involved in this Title III Project during Semi-Monthly Parent Meetings and through participation in the Superintendent-Parent Council Meetings and Special Education Chairmen Meetings which are held monthly. The Semi-Monthly Parent Meetings included presentations made by various district staff members as well as presentations made by people from within the community. Topics which were covered during these meetings included the effect of drugs on children with learning problems, the use of contingency management programs for managing children's behavior at home and at school, Rudolf Dreikurs' theory for child management, a movie entitled, "Why Johnny Can't Learn," produced by CANHC, a presentation by the Fountain Valley High School Special Education Department on what high school has to offer children with special learning problems, a presentation by Special Education Students from a neighboring high school district who had been involved in a vocational education program, an experience of learning to read all over again entitled, A Primer for Parents, an open forum on how to improve existing special education

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

services, a presentation to a neighboring school district by our parents on integrated special education and what it has to offer, and various other topics of prime concern to our parents.

Parents in the community were kept informed of various new aspects to our Special Education Program through the Special Education Chairman at each of the schools. Articles were written in the school newsette and in a district publication entitled, "Up With Kids." The local newspaper, "The Daily Pilot," as well as "The Los Angeles Times" presented feature articles on the Special Education Programs in the district.

Special Factors

The Special Education Model which was developed during these past three years is quite flexible and lends itself to numerous adaptations. The open structure buildings and learning centers in the Fountain Valley School District are almost an ideal setting for this type of special education program, however it is the opinion of the staff involved in the project that this program could also function quite adequately in a more traditional school building. Portable buildings or empty classrooms could be used as learning centers for the entire student body. The most important contingency for the successful adaptation of this program is a commitment on the part of the staff to the basic philosophy that all children are different and that all children should be provided with individualized programs to meet these individual differences. The program could be gradually phased in utilizing those teachers or staff who have made a commitment to the basic philosophy of this program. The Special Education Teacher would gradually shift her role from classroom teacher to resource specialist as her children are gradually integrated into the regular classroom program. Public

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

acknowledgement of the successes of those participants in the program will soon yield requests by more and more teachers to participate in the program. The Fountain Valley School District presently has a waiting list of teachers desiring to participate in some aspect of its Special Education Program.

EVALUATION

Choosing Participants

Children were selected to participate in this project by qualifying for admittance into the program for Educable Mentally Retarded or Educationally Handicapped. Because of community preference, all children who met these qualifications were allowed to participate in the program. Participants left the program for a number of reasons including moving out of the area, achieving at grade level expectancy or exceeding cut-off criterion on individual intelligence tests which are administered yearly. The number of participants in the program has remained fairly stable over the last three years; that is, approximately the same number of students who left the program were also admitted to the program. Evaluation of the project was conducted yearly on the basis of pre- and post-tests administered to all project participants.

Describing Participants

All of the participants in the program at the initiation of the project were achieving at least two years below grade level and had been averaging approximately three months' gain in grade equivalent units per year. At the beginning of the third and final phase of the project, the students enrolled in the program were expected to gain between 4 and 8 months' grade equivalent units per year based on their pre-test scores. (Refer to Table Number 1)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The following formula was utilized to determine expected gain:

$$\frac{\text{Pre-test G.E.}}{\text{C.A.} - \text{E.A.}} \quad *$$

Of the 90 participants in the project this year, 59 were enrolled in the EMR program and 31 were enrolled in the EH program. The ages of the students in the EMR program ranged from 6 years, 2 months, to 14 years, 5 months; and for those in the EH program from 6 years, 8 months, to 13 years, 2 months. The students were enrolled in grade levels kindergarten through 8. The mean Full Scale IQ for EMR students was 71. IQ tests were not given this past year to students enrolled in the program for the educationally handicapped. (Refer to Table Number 2)

Measuring Changes

Pre and post-measures were applied to determine whether or not the specific goals and objectives of the project were achieved. Instruments were used for each of the three major areas of assessment: academic achievement, student and teacher acceptance, and self-concept. All instruments were selected on the basis of appropriateness of use for the handicapped population with which this program dealt. All measurement was carried on by project staff and therefore it was unnecessary for specially trained observers or technicians to be used. Pre and post-tests were administered in the 8 months between October and May or November and June.

*Where C.A. equals the subject's chronological age at the time of the pre-test and E.A. is equal to the subject's chronological age when he entered school.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Presenting Data

Raw scores, standard scores when applicable, and grade equivalent scores were collected for each of the participants enrolled in the Title III program. Means and standard deviations were the primary measures of central tendency and dispersion which were used. Academic achievement was presented in terms of grade equivalent pre-test scores and expected grade equivalent scores which were calculated using the formula previously described. Raw scores, means and standard deviations were also collected for each of the affective variables measured.

Figure #1 on the following page indicates the mean expected grade equivalent scores obtained by project students over the 3 years in the academic areas of reading and arithmetic. The mean scores obtained on each of the affective measures during this period may be found in Tables 20-23.

Analyzing Data

Five different statistical procedures were undertaken to determine whether or not specific project objectives were met: (1) the percentage of students meeting a specific criterion for stated objectives; (2) a t-test for correlated means; (3) a t-test for independent means; (4) a one-way analysis of co-variance; and (5) a multiple-regression analysis. The procedure for the percentage of students meeting specific criteria was applied to variables in Objectives 1 and 3. t-tests for correlated means analyzed the differences between pre and post-tests and the differences between expected and actual grade equivalent scores. t-tests for independent means compared groups on mean grade equivalent gains. The one-way analysis of co-variance procedure tested the significance of the difference between post-tests mean scores adjusted on pre-test mean scores.

FIGURE NUMBER 1

DIFFERENCES IN MEAN EXPECTED GRADE EQUIVALENT SCORES FOR EMR AND EH STUDENTS IN READING AND ARITHMETIC DURING A THREE YEAR PERIOD



* expected grade equivalent scores were calculated differently in 1971-72 giving slightly higher expected grade equivalents

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The multiple-regression analysis predicted grade equivalent gain scores in academic achievement and post-test scores for affective variables.

Major Project Goal

It was the intent of this project to (1) integrate into regular classrooms all of the educable mentally retarded and educationally handicapped students in the Fountain Valley School District within three years and (2) to develop a system to provide the special education resource teachers continuous feedback on pupil progress to insure that each student will be involved in an appropriate educational program.

Results:

At the conclusion of the third and final phase of this project, all handicapped students (educable mentally retarded or educationally handicapped) were successfully integrated into regular classroom programs. A daily individual contract system was developed by the resource teachers for continuous monitoring of the academic and social progress of each of the students. Also, specific behavioral objectives were developed for each of the commercial programs used in the project which enabled resource teachers to monitor pupil progress through each of these programs.

Project Objectives and Findings

Project outcome objectives were developed in order to assess the academic, social and affective growth of each of the students participating in this program. The following objectives were developed:

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1.0 Improvement in academic performance will be demonstrated if 75% of the students perform at or above their grade level expectancies as determined by September test scores on the Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT) in reading and mathematics; and 75% of the students demonstrate at least 75% mastery of the subject matter presented during the school year as measured by project-developed criterion tests.

The results of these objectives were as follows: 81% of the students met or exceeded their expected grade equivalent increase in reading; 89% of the students met or exceeded their expected grade equivalent increase in mathematics; 100% of the students met the expected criterion on the reading criterion tests; and 90% of the students met the arithmetic criterion on project-developed measures. (Refer to Table 1)

During this phase of the project, students enrolled in the program for Educable Mentally Retarded were expected to achieve five months' growth in reading; their actual gain was nine months which was significant at the .01 level. These students had an expected achievement gain of five months in arithmetic; their actual gain was twelve months which was also significant at the .01 level. The students enrolled in the program for Educationally Handicapped were expected to achieve seven months' growth in reading; their actual gain was eleven months, which was non-significant. These students had an expected achievement gain of seven months in arithmetic; their actual gain was twelve months, which was significant at the .05 level (Refer to Figure 2, following page). All handicapped students demonstrated significant increases in academic performance between pre and post-tests (Refer to Table 3).

When comparisons were made between educable mentally retarded students and educationally handicapped students on their academic growth, no significant difference was found (Refer to Table 4). Also, there were no significant

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FIGURE NUMBER 2

EXPECTED AND ACTUAL GRADE EQUIVALENT INCREASES (GEI) FOR EMR AND EH STUDENTS IN READING AND ARITHMETIC



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

differences between the performance of handicapped students at Fulton and *Gisler Schools (Refer to Table 5). However, there were significant differences found between educable mentally retarded and educationally handicapped students in terms of the number of minutes of individual instruction provided daily for these groups, where significantly more time was spent with the EMR students vs. the EH students at Fulton School and with the EH students vs. the EMR students at Gisler School (Refer to Table 6). A multiple-regression analysis which Table 7 presents was performed to determine which of the independent variables were the most efficient predictors of academic success. The number of days a pupil was enrolled in the program and the number of hours per day of individual instruction had a multiple R coefficient of 0.58 with academic success in reading. The number of days in the program and the students expected grade equivalent score in reading had a multiple R coefficient of 0.68 with academic success in arithmetic. There was no significant correlation between academic success and IQ scores obtained by the handicapped children enrolled in this program.

2.0 Project students will be accepted by classroom teachers in May as well or better than they were in September as measured by teacher ratings on bi-polar adjectives from the evaluative scale of the Semantic Differential; and project students will be accepted by regular classroom students in May as well or better than they were in September as measured by the number of votes received for class offices.

There was no significant difference in the mean values obtained by project students and non-project students when rated by teachers on the evaluative scale of the Semantic Differential. Ratings for all students tended to be somewhat higher than the scale's mid-point which indicated that teachers looked at all students in a positive manner. Some differences were found when individual bi-polar adjectives were analyzed separately. For example, when the bi-polar adjectives kind and cruel were rated by regular classroom teachers,

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

the handicapped pupils at one of the project schools tended to be looked at as less kind than their normal peers at the end of the school year. Also, on the nice-awful bi-polar adjective, the educationally handicapped students at one school were viewed significantly more favorably than the educationally handicapped students at the other school. On the bi-polar adjective wise-foolish, the handicapped population at one of the project schools was viewed as less wise than the normal non-handicapped students. However, these three significant comparisons out of eighty-eight different analyses could have occurred by chance alone and therefore, these findings may be considered as not significant (Tables 8 and 9).

Figure #3 on the following page shows the acceptance of project students by non-project students which was analyzed during the first two quarters of school by comparing expected frequency of classroom elections with actual frequency. During the first quarter, the number of project students elected to class office was equal to the expectancy of "normal" students being elected. Teachers decided during the last two quarters that they no longer wanted to hold classroom elections. In order to determine how well the project students were getting along with their non-project peers, interviews were used. The teachers polled indicated that project students were invited to participate in classroom activities with approximately the same frequency as non-project students. When new students came into the classroom, there was a tendency toward some over-indulgence. The overall tendency, however, was that there was no difficulty in having project students accepted by their "normal" peers.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FIGURE NUMBER 3

NUMBER OF STUDENTS ELECTED TO CLASS OFFICES AT
FULTON SCHOOL



o = 1969-70 School Year
x = 1970-71 School Year

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

3.0 Improvement in self-concept will be demonstrated if 75% of the project students score the same or higher in May than they did in September on the Stick Figure Test and if 75% of the project students score the same or higher in May than they did in September on the Auditory Self-Concept Measuring Instrument (ASCMI) and on their measured level of aspiration.

The following percentages of students met or exceeded the criterion on each of the following measures: On the Student Questionnaire, 57% of the EMR students and 19% of the EH students met the criterion (Table 10). On the Stick Figure Test, 61% of the EMR and 20% of the EH students met the criterion (Table 11). On the Auditory Self-Concept Measuring Instrument, 55% of the EMR students and 38% of the EH students met the criterion of the evaluative scale (Table 12), and 55% of the EMR students and 69% of the EH students met the criterion of the Dynamism Scale (Table 13). On the Level of Aspiration measure, 49% of the EMR students and 53% of the EH students met the criterion (Table 14). The intent of the objective was to determine whether or not there were significant differences between pre and post tests or between handicapped groups on these affective measures. On the Student Questionnaire there was a significant difference between pre and post-tests for EH students in the program where these students tended to get significantly lower scores at the year's end (Table 10). This finding was also true of EH students on the Stick Figure Test (Table 11). There were no significant differences between pre and post-tests on the ASCMI Evaluative or Dynamism Scale (Tables 12 and 13). However, on the Level of Aspiration measure, EMR students tended to have significantly lower levels of aspiration at year's end (Table 14). When differences were looked for between groups on each of the affective measures, the following results were obtained: On Student Questionnaire, EMR students obtained significantly higher scores than EH students (Table 15). This was also true of the Stick Figure Test (Table 16). There were no significant differences found between groups on the other affective measures (Tables 17, 18, and 19).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

It would appear from these analyses that EH students tended to view school and school related activities in a less favorable way at year's end when compared to themselves on pre-tests or when compared to EMR students. However, there was generally no significant differences between pre and post-measures or between groups on each of the measures for a majority of the affective instruments employed. Evaluation of individual scores obtained by the students on each of the instruments indicated that the students tended to obtain scores at the positive end of the continuum on each measure. Differences which were found, therefore, were differences between very high and high scores on each of the variables. Thus, it would appear that the handicapped pupils have a generally favorable outlook on themselves and on school and school related activities throughout the year.

A multiple-regression analysis to determine the most efficient predictors of positive student responses on these affective measures were as follows: For positive responses for students on the Student Questionnaire, the best predictors were Full Scale IQ and their Expected Grade Equivalent Score in arithmetic. The best predictors for positive student responses on the Stick Figure Test were Full Scale IQ and Expected Grade Equivalent Scores in reading. On the ASCMI, which yields two scores, an Evaluative Score and a Dynamism Score, the number of days in the program and Verbal IQ were the best predictors of high Evaluative and Dynamism Scores. (Refer to Table 7)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE NUMBER 1

SUMMARY OF ACHIEVEMENT GAINS FOR ALL STUDENTS ENROLLED
IN THE PROGRAM--EDUCABLE MENTALLY RETARDED AND EDUCATIONALLY HANDICAPPED

Subject	Student Category	N	$\bar{X}$ Expected Gain	$\bar{X}$ Actual Gain *	% Meeting Expected Gain	t	$S.D._D$	Criterion % **
Reading	EMR	44	.45	.93	84%	4.70 xx	.65	100%
Reading	EH	19	.71	1.07	74%	1.59 ns	.82	100%
Reading	EMR & EH	63	.53	.97	81%	4.55 xx	.76	100%
Arithmetic	EMR	43	.48	1.17	91%	8.08 xx	.51	94%
Arithmetic	EH	19	.72	1.17	84%	2.51 x	.64	80%
Arithmetic	EMR & EH	62	.55	1.17	89%	7.68 xx	.63	90%

* $\bar{X}$ Actual Gain in tenths of years

$S.D._D$ Standard Deviation of the $\bar{X}$ difference

** % of subjects at or above the 75% correct criterion

xx significant at .01 level

ns non-significant

x significant at .05 level

TABLE NUMBER 2

DESCRIPTION OF PARTICIPANTS

School	Student Category	N - Males	N - Females	N - Total	Present Age Range	Present Grade Level Range	$\bar{X}$ Verbal I.Q.	S.D. $\bar{X}$ Verbal I.Q.	$\bar{X}$ Performance I.Q.	S.D. $\bar{X}$ Performance I.Q.	$\bar{X}$ Full Scale I.Q.	S.D. $\bar{X}$ Full Scale I.Q.
Fulton	EMR	19	10	29	6.8 - 14.5	K - 8	72.46	10.43	75.50	12.27	71.31	11.32
Fulton	EH	13	3	16	8.1 - 13.2	1 - 7	*	*	*	*	*	*
Gisler	EMR	10	20	30	6.2 - 13.7	1 - 8	70.40	10.03	75.84	16.07	70.44	12.43
Gisler	EH	11	4	15	6.8 - 12.9	2 - 7	*	*	*	*	*	*

* no data for this variable

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE NUMBER 3

t-TESTS FOR THE SIGNIFICANCE OF PRE AND POST TEST MEAN DIFFERENCES IN GRADE EQUIVALENT SCORES BY SUBJECT AND STUDENT CATEGORY

School	Subject	Student Category	N	$\bar{X}$ dif *	S.D.$_{\bar{X}\ dif}$	t
Fulton & Gisler	Reading	EMR	44	.93	.65	9.35 xx
Fulton & Gisler	Arithmetic	EMR	43	1.18	.51	14.99 xx
Fulton & Gisler	Reading	EH	19	1.07	.82	5.69 xx
Fulton & Gisler	Arithmetic	EH	19	1.17	.64	7.76 xx
Fulton	Reading	EMR	22	.81	.65	5.71 xx
Fulton	Arithmetic	EMR	22	1.25	.59	9.88 xx
Fulton	Reading	EH	12	.97	.83	3.89 xx
Fulton	Arithmetic	EH	12	1.23	.68	5.99 xx
Gisler	Reading	EMR	22	1.04	.65	7.32 xx
Gisler	Arithmetic	EMR	21	1.10	.43	11.37 xx
Gisler	Reading	EH	7	1.24	.84	3.61 xx
Gisler	Arithmetic	EH	7	1.07	.62	4.24 xx
Fulton	Reading	EMR & EH	34	.87	.71	7.04 xx
Fulton	Arithmetic	EMR & EH	34	1.24	.61	11.68 xx
Gisler	Reading	EMR & EH	29	1.09	.69	8.36 xx
Gisler	Arithmetic	EMR & EH	28	1.10	.47	12.06 xx

* $\bar{X}$ dif equals $\bar{X}$ gain and is the mean of differences between pre-test grade equivalent scores and post-test grade equivalent scores.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE NUMBER 4

t-TESTS FOR THE SIGNIFICANCE OF PRE AND POST TEST MEAN DIFFERENCES IN GRADE EQUIVALENT SCORES FOR EMR AND EH STUDENTS

School	Subject	Student Category	N	$\bar{X}$ dif *	S.D.$_{X\ dif}$	t
Fulton & Gisler	Reading	EMR	44	.93	.65	.69 ns
Fulton & Gisler	Reading	EH	19	1.07	.82	
Fulton & Gisler	Arithmetic	EMR	43	1.17	.51	- .02 ns
Fulton & Gisler	Arithmetic	EH	19	1.17	.64	
Fulton	Reading	EMR	22	.81	.65	.58 ns
Fulton	Reading	EH	12	.97	.83	
Fulton	Arithmetic	EMR	22	1.23	.58	- .03 ns
Fulton	Arithmetic	EH	12	1.23	.68	
Gisler	Reading	EMR	22	1.04	.65	.58 ns
Gisler	Reading	EH	7	1.24	.84	
Gisler	Arithmetic	EMR	21	1.11	.43	- .15 ns
Gisler	Arithmetic	EH	7	1.07	.62	

* $\bar{X}$ dif equals $\bar{X}$ gain and is the mean of differences between pre-test grade equivalent scores and post-test grade equivalent scores.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE NUMBER 5

t-TESTS FOR THE SIGNIFICANCE OF PRE AND POST TEST MEAN DIFFERENCES IN GRADE EQUIVALENT SCORES BETWEEN HANDICAPPED CHILDREN AT FULTON AND GISLER SCHOOLS

School	Subject	Student Category	N	$\bar{X}$ dif *	S.D.$_{\bar{X}\ dif}$	t
Fulton	Reading	EMR & EH	34	.87	.71	1.24 ns
Gisler	Reading	EMR & EH	29	1.09	.69	
Fulton	Arithmetic	EMR & EH	34	1.23	.61	- .94 ns
Gisler	Arithmetic	EMR & EH	28	1.10	.47	
Fulton	Reading	EMR	22	.81	.65	- 1.16 ns
Gisler	Reading	EMR	22	1.04	.65	
Fulton	Reading	EH	12	.97	.83	.6[illegible] ns
Gisler	Reading	EH	7	1.24	.84	
Fulton	Arithmetic	EMR	22	1.25	.58	- .90 ns
Gisler	Arithmetic	EMR	21	1.11	.43	
Fulton	Arithmetic	EH	12	1.23	.68	- .50 ns
Gisler	Arithmetic	EH	7	1.07	.62	

* $\bar{X}$ dif equals $\bar{X}$ gain and is the mean of differences between pre-test grade equivalent scores and post-test grade equivalent scores.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE NUMBER 6

t-TESTS FOR THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MEAN NUMBER OF HOURS OF INDIVIDUAL INSTRUCTION

School	Student Category	N	$\bar{X}$ Hours	S.D.	t
Fulton	EMR	27	1.87	.70	- 6.21 xx
Fulton	EH	12	.89	.28	
Gisler	EMR	29	.91	.27	4.18 xx
Gisler	EH	12	1.61	.55	
Fulton & Gisler	EMR	56	1.37	.71	- .79 ns
Fulton & Gisler	EH	24	1.25	.56	
Fulton	EMR	27	1.87	.70	- 6.63 xx
Gisler	EMR	29	.91	.27	
Fulton	EH	12	.89	.28	4.03 xx
Gisler	EH	12	1.61	.55	
Fulton	EMR & EH	39	1.57	.75	- 3.15 xx
Gisler	EMR & EH	41	1.12	.49	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE NUMBER 7

MULTIPLE-REGRESSION ANALYSIS IDENTIFYING THE MOST EFFICIENT PREDICTORS OF ACHIEVEMENT AND AFFECTIVE VARIABLES

Step	Predictor Variables	Predicted Variables	Multiple R	R^2*	F
1	Number of days in program	Reading Gain	.54	.30	36.89 xx
2	Number of hours in day		.58	.34	22.27 xx
1	Number of days in program	Arithmetic Gain	.68	.46	75.39 xx
2	Expected G.E. in reading		.72	.51	45.66 xx
1	Full Scale I.Q.	Post Student Questionnaire	.43	.18	19.53 xx
2	Expected G.E. in arithmetic		.49	.24	13.94 xx
1	Full Scale I.Q.	Post Stick Figure	.44	.20	21.57 xx
2	Expected G.E. in reading		.51	.26	15.49 xx
1	Number of days in program	Post E_T	.37	.14	14.40 xx
2	Verbal I.Q.		.44	.18	10.31 xx
1	Number of days in program	Post D_T	.37	.14	13.79 xx
2	Verbal I.Q.		.42	.18	9.42 xx

* R^2 = % of variance

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE NUMBER 8

t-TESTS FOR THE SIGNIFICANCE OF PRE AND POST TEST MEAN DIFFERENCES IN BI-POLAR ADJECTIVES ON THE TEACHER SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL

Subject	School	Student Category	N	$\bar{X}$ dif	S.D. $\bar{X}$ dif	t
Clean-Dirty	Fulton	EMR	26	-0.15	0.78	-0.96 ns
Clean-Dirty	Fulton	EH	10	0.20	2.25	0.27 ns
Clean-Dirty	Gisler	EMR	20	-0.25	0.85	-1.28 ns
Clean-Dirty	Gisler	EH	6	0.00	0.89	0.00 ns
Clean-Dirty	Fulton & Gisler	EMR	46	-0.19	0.81	-1.57 ns
Clean-Dirty	Fulton & Gisler	EH	16	0.13	1.82	0.27 ns
Clean-Dirty	Fulton	EMR & EH	36	-0.05	1.33	-0.25 ns
Clean-Dirty	Gisler	EMR & EH	26	-0.19	0.85	-1.12 ns
Wise-Foolish	Fulton	EMR	26	0.04	1.43	0.14 ns
Wise-Foolish	Fulton	EH	9	0.11	1.97	0.17 ns
Wise-Foolish	Gisler	EMR	20	0.00	1.17	0.00 ns
Wise-Foolish	Gisler	EH	6	-0.33	0.52	-1.43 ns
Wise-Foolish	Fulton & Gisler	EMR	46	0.02	1.31	0.11 ns
Wise-Foolish	Fulton & Gisler	EH	15	-0.07	1.53	-0.17 ns
Wise-Foolish	Fulton	EMR & EH	35	0.06	1.55	0.22 ns
Wise-Foolish	Gisler	EMR & EH	26	-0.08	1.06	-0.38 ns
Kind-Cruel	Fulton	EMR	26	-0.50	1.30	-1.92 x
Kind-Cruel	Fulton	EH	10	-0.50	1.35	-1.11 ns
Kind-Cruel	Gisler	EMR	20	-0.30	1.26	-1.04 ns
Kind-Cruel	Gisler	EH	6	0.83	1.33	1.40 ns
Kind-Cruel	Fulton & Gisler	EMR	46	-0.41	1.27	-2.15 x
Kind-Cruel	Fulton & Gisler	EH	16	0.00	1.46	0.00 ns
Kind-Cruel	Fulton	EMR & EH	36	-0.50	1.30	-2.28 x
Kind-Cruel	Gisler	EMR & EH	26	-0.04	1.34	-0.15 ns
Sweet-Sour	Fulton	EMR	26	-0.15	1.25	-0.59 ns
Sweet-Sour	Fulton	EH	10	-0.30	1.34	-0.67 ns
Sweet-Sour	Gisler	EMR	20	-0.55	1.28	-1.87 x
Sweet-Sour	Gisler	EH	6	0.00	1.09	0.00 ns
Sweet-Sour	Fulton & Gisler	EMR	46	-0.33	1.27	-1.75 x
Sweet-Sour	Fulton & Gisler	EH	16	-0.19	1.22	-0.57 ns
Sweet-Sour	Fulton	EMR & EH	36	-0.19	1.26	-0.89 ns
Sweet-Sour	Gisler	EMR & EH	26	-0.42	1.24	-1.69 ns

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE NUMBER 8 (CONTINUED)

Subject	School	Student Category	N	$\bar{X}$ dif	S.D.$_{\bar{X}\,dif}$	t
Good-Bad	Fulton	EMR	25	-0.28	1.62	-0.86 ns
Good-Bad	Fulton	EH	10	-0.20	1.13	-0.53 ns
Good-Bad	Gisler	EMR	20	-0.45	1.28	-1.53 ns
Good-Bad	Gisler	EH	6	0.33	1.03	0.72 ns
Good-Bad	Fulton & Gisler	EMR	45	-0.35	1.46	-1.65 ns
Good-Bad	Fulton & Gisler	EH	16	0.00	1.09	0.00 ns
Good-Bad	Fulton	EMR & EH	35	-0.26	1.48	-1.03 ns
Good-Bad	Gisler	EMR & EH	26	-0.27	1.25	-1.08 ns
Nice-Awful	Fulton	EMR	26	-0.23	1.18	-0.97 ns
Nice-Awful	Fulton	EH	10	-0.20	0.63	-0.95 ns
Nice-Awful	Gisler	EMR	20	-0.55	1.28	-1.87 x
Nice-Awful	Gisler	EH	6	1.00	0.89	2.51 x
Nice-Awful	Fulton & Gisler	EMR	46	-0.37	1.22	-2.03 x
Nice-Awful	Fulton & Gisler	EH	16	0.25	0.93	1.04 ns
Nice-Awful	Fulton	EMR & EH	36	-0.22	1.05	-1.25 ns
Nice-Awful	Gisler	EMR & EH	26	-0.19	1.36	-0.70 ns
Fair-Unfair	Fulton	EMR	26	-0.19	1.10	-0.86 ns
Fair-Unfair	Fulton	EH	10	0.30	1.42	0.63 ns
Fair-Unfair	Gisler	EMR	20	-0.35	1.04	-1.47 ns
Fair-Unfair	Gisler	EH	6	-0.17	0.98	-0.38 ns
Fair-Unfair	Fulton & Gisler	EMR	46	-0.26	1.06	-1.65 ns
Fair-Unfair	Fulton & Gisler	EH	16	0.13	1.26	0.37 ns
Fair-Unfair	Fulton	EMR & EH	36	-0.05	1.19	-0.28 ns
Fair-Unfair	Gisler	EMR & EH	26	-0.31	1.01	-1.52 ns
Happy-Sad	Fulton	EMR	26	-0.50	1.45	-1.72 x
Happy-Sad	Fulton	EH	10	0.00	0.82	0.00 ns
Happy-Sad	Gisler	EMR	20	-0.50	1.39	-1.56 ns
Happy-Sad	Gisler	EH	6	0.00	1.27	0.00 ns
Happy-Sad	Fulton & Gisler	EMR	46	-0.50	1.41	-2.38 x
Happy-Sad	Fulton & Gisler	EH	16	0.00	0.97	0.00 ns
Happy-Sad	Fulton	EMR & EH	36	-0.36	1.31	-1.63 ns
Happy-Sad	Gisler	EMR & EH	26	-0.38	1.36	-1.40 ns

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE NUMBER 9

F-RATIOS FOR ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE FOR COMPARISONS AMONG EMR, EH AND NON-HANDICAPPED STUDENTS ON POST-TEST BI-POLAR ADJECTIVES ADJUSTED FOR MEAN DIFFERENCES ON PRE-TEST BI-POLAR ADJECTIVES

Subject	School	Student Category	Adj. $\bar{X}$	S.E. Adj. $\bar{X}$	df	F-Ratio
Clean-Dirty	Fulton	EMR	5.52	0.26	(1,33)	0.05 ns
Clean-Dirty	Fulton	EH	5.64	0.43		
Clean-Dirty	Fulton	EMR	5.61	0.23	(1,59)	0.15 ns
Clean-Dirty	Fulton	Normal	5.73	0.20		
Clean-Dirty	Fulton	EH	5.29	0.46	(1,43)	0.33 ns
Clean-Dirty	Fulton	Normal	5.59	0.24		
Clean-Dirty	Fulton	EMR	5.67	0.16	(1,43)	0.16 ns
Clean-Dirty	Gisler	EMR	5.57	0.18		
Clean-Dirty	Fulton	EH	5.14	0.53	(1,13)	0.00 ns
Clean-Dirty	Gisler	EH	5.09	0.69		
Clean-Dirty	Gisler	EMR	5.41	0.25	(1,43)	0.30 ns
Clean-Dirty	Gisler	Normal	5.60	0.22		
Clean-Dirty	Gisler	EH	5.33	0.50	(1,29)	0.09 ns
Clean-Dirty	Gisler	Normal	5.50	0.24		
Clean-Dirty	Gisler	EMR	5.38	0.19	(1,23)	0.20 ns
Clean-Dirty	Gisler	EH	5.56	0.36		
Clean-Dirty	Gisler	EMR & EH	5.40	0.21	(1,49)	0.31 ns
Clean-Dirty	Gisler	Normal	5.57	0.21		
Clean-Dirty	Fulton	EMR & EH	5.54	0.22	(1,69)	0.14 ns
Clean-Dirty	Fulton	Normal	5.65	0.22		
Clean-Dirty	Fulton	EMR & EH	5.56	0.19	(1,59)	0.22 ns
Clean-Dirty	Gisler	EMR & EH	5.42	0.22		
Clean-Dirty	Fulton & Gisler	EMR	5.46	0.17	(1,59)	0.21 ns
Clean-Dirty	Fulton & Gisler	EH	5.61	0.29		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE NUMBER 9 (CONTINUED)

Subject	School	Student Category	Adj. $\bar{X}$	S.E. Adj. $\bar{X}$	df	F-Ratio
Wise-Foolish	Fulton	EMR	4.48	0.20		
					(1,32)	0.63 ns
Wise-Foolish	Fulton	EH	4.16	0.35		
Wise-Foolish	Fulton	EMR	4.63	0.21		
					(1,59)	3.03 ns
Wise-Foolish	Fulton	Normal	5.13	0.18		
Wise-Foolish	Fulton	EH	4.39	0.37		
					(1,42)	3.26 ns
Wise-Foolish	Fulton	Normal	5.15	0.18		
Wise-Foolish	Fulton	EMR	4.54	0.23		
					(1,43)	0.02 ns
Wise-Foolish	Gisler	EMR	4.59	0.26		
Wise-Foolish	Fulton	EH	4.18	0.37		
					(1,12)	0.04 ns
Wise-Foolish	Gisler	EH	4.06	0.45		
Wise-Foolish	Gisler	EMR	4.90	0.22		
					(1,43)	0.33 ns
Wise-Foolish	Gisler	Normal	5.07	0.19		
Wise-Foolish	Gisler	EH	4.65	0.33		
					(1,29)	1.96 ns
Wise-Foolish	Gisler	Normal	5.16	0.15		
Wise-Foolish	Gisler	EMR	4.62	0.24		
					(1,23)	0.50 ns
Wise-Foolish	Gisler	EH	4.27	0.44		
Wise-Foolish	Gisler	EMR & EH	4.78	0.19		
					(1,49)	0.81 ns
Wise-Foolish	Gisler	Normal	5.02	0.19		
Wise-Fulton	Fulton	EMR & EH	4.51	0.18		
					(1,68)	5.19 x
Wise-Foolish	Fulton	Normal	5.11	0.18		
Wise-Fulton	Fulton	EMR & EH	4.45	0.19		
					(1,58)	0.00 ns
Wise-Foolish	Gisler	EMR & EH	4.46	0.23		
Wise-Foolish	Fulton & Gisler	EMR	4.53	0.17		
					(1,58)	0.64 ns
Wise-Foolish	Fulton & Gisler	EH	4.25	0.29		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE NUMBER 9 (CONTINUED)

Subject	School	Student Category	Adj. $\bar{X}$	S.E. Adj. $\bar{X}$	df	F-Ratio
Kind-Cruel	Fulton	EMR	5.22	0.22	(1,33)	0.45 ns
Kind-Cruel	Fulton	EH	4.93	0.36		
Kind-Cruel	Fulton	EMR	5.23	0.19	(1,59)	3.03 ns
Kind-Cruel	Fulton	Normal	5.67	0.16		
Kind-Cruel	Fulton	EH	4.95	0.29	(1,43)	3.73 ns
Kind-Cruel	Fulton	Normal	5.60	0.15		
Kind-Cruel	Fulton	EMR	5.29	0.23	(1,43)	0.44 ns
Kind-Cruel	Gisler	EMR	5.52	0.27		
Kind-Cruel	Fulton	EH	4.69	0.34	(1,13)	1.33 ns
Kind-Cruel	Gisler	EH	5.35	0.45		
Kind-Cruel	Gisler	EMR	5.52	0.24	(1,43)	0.15 ns
Kind-Cruel	Gisler	Normal	5.64	0.21		
Kind-Cruel	Gisler	EH	5.87	0.41	(1,29)	0.79 ns
Kind-Cruel	Gisler	Normal	5.45	0.19		
Kind-Cruel	Gisler	EMR	5.34	0.27	(1,23)	0.75 ns
Kind-Cruel	Gisler	EH	5.88	0.54		
Kind-Cruel	Gisler	EMR & EH	5.54	0.21	(1,49)	0.00 ns
	Gisler	Normal	5.53	0.21		
Kind-Cruel	Fulton	EMR-EH	5.14	0.17	(1,69)	4.52 x
Kind-Cruel	Fulton	Normal	5.64	0.17		
Kind-Cruel	Fulton	EMR & EH	5.56	0.19	(1,59)	0.22 ns
Kind-Cruel	Gisler	EMR & EH	5.42	0.22		
Kind-Cruel	Fulton & Gisler	EMR	5.29	0.17	(1,59)	0.03 ns
Kind-Cruel	Fulton & Gisler	EH	5.23	0.30		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE NUMBER 9 (CONTINUED)

Subject	School	Student Category	Adj. $\bar{X}$	S.E. Adj. $\bar{X}$	df	F-Ratio
Sweet-Sour	Fulton	EMR	5.25	0.22	(1,33)	0.47 ns
Sweet-Sour	Fulton	EH	4.96	0.35		
Sweet-Sour	Fulton	EMR	5.23	0.21	(1,58)	1.73 ns
Sweet-Sour	Fulton	Normal	5.60	0.19		
Sweet-Sour	Fulton	EH	4.91	0.33	(1,42)	3.05 ns
Sweet-Sour	Fulton	Normal	5.57	0.18		
Sweet-Sour	Fulton	EMR	5.43	0.25	(1,43)	0.55 ns
Sweet-Sour	Gisler	EMR	5.14	0.28		
Sweet-Sour	Fulton	EH	4.91	0.28	(1,13)	0.73 ns
Sweet-Sour	Gisler	EH	5.31	0.37		
Sweet-Sour	Gisler	EMR	5.28	0.27	(1,43)	0.00 ns
Sweet-Sour	Gisler	Normal	5.28	0.24		
Sweet-Sour	Gisler	EH	5.60	0.45	(1,29)	0.74 ns
Sweet-Sour	Gisler	Normal	5.17	0.21		
Sweet-Sour	Gisler	EMR	5.24	0.28	(1,23)	0.64 ns
Sweet-Sour	Gisler	EH	5.71	0.52		
Sweet-Sour	Gisler	EMR & EH	5.35	0.23	(1,49)	0.12 ns
	Gisler	Normal	5.23	0.23		
Sweet-Sour	Fulton	EMR & EH	5.15	0.18	(1,68)	3.03 ns
Sweet-Sour	Fulton	Normal	5.59	0.18		
Sweet-Sour	Fulton	EMR & EH	5.27	0.20	(1,59)	0.05 ns
Sweet-Sour	Gisler	EMR & EH	5.20	0.23		
Sweet-Sour	Fulton & Gisler	EMR	5.24	0.17	(1,59)	0.00 ns
Sweet-Sour	Fulton & Gisler	EH	5.23	0.30		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE NUMBER 9 (CONTINUED)

Subject	School	Student Category	Adj. $\bar{X}$	S.E. Adj. $\bar{X}$	df	F-Ratio
Good-Bad	Fulton	EMR	5.21	0.26	(1,32)	0.11 ns
Good-Bad	Fulton	EH	5.37	0.41		
Good-Bad	Fulton	EMR	5,21	0.23	(1,58)	1.23 ns
Good-Bad	Fulton	Normal	5.55	0.19		
Good-Bad	Fulton	EH	5.39	0.29	(1,43)	0.29 ns
Good-Bad	Fulton	Normal	5.56	0.15		
Good-Bad	Fulton	EMR	5.29	0.27	(1,42)	0.06 ns
Good-Bad	Gisler	EMR	5.39	0.30		
Good-Bad	Fulton	EH	5.18	0.30	(1,13)	0.00 ns
Good-Bad	Gisler	EH	5.21	0.39		
Good-Bad	Gisler	EMR	5.47	0.25	(1,43)	0.42 ns
Good-Bad	Gisler	Normal	5.68	0.22		
Good-Bad	Gisler	EH	5.50	0.47	(1,29)	0.00 ns
Good-Bad	Gisler	Normal	5.50	0.21		
Good-Bad	Gisler	EMR	5.29	0.27	(1,23)	0.16 ns
Good-Bad	Gisler	EH	5.53	0.52		
Good-Bad	Gisler	EMR & EH	5.41	0.22	(1,49)	0.32 ns
	Gisler	Normal	5.59	0.22		
Good-Bad	Fulton	EMR & EH	5.26	0.19	(1,68)	1.18 ns
Good-Bad	Fulton	Normal	5.55	0.18		
Good-Bad	Fulton	EMR & EH	5.28	0.21	(1,58)	0.02 ns
Good-Bad	Gisler	EMR & EH	5.32	0.24		
Good-Bad	Fulton & Gisler	EMR	5.27	0.18	(1,58)	0.06 ns
Good-Bad	Fulton & Gisler	EH	5.36	0.31		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE NUMBER 9 (CONTINUED)

Subject	School	Student Category	Adj. $\bar{X}$	S.E. Adj. $\bar{X}$	df	F-Ratio
Nice-Awful	Fulton	EMR	5.51	0.20		
Nice-Awful	Fulton	EH	5.47	0.32	(1,33)	0.01 ns
Nice-Awful	Fulton	EMR	5.54	0.20		
Nice-Awful	Fulton	Normal	5.83	0.17	(1,59)	1.24 ns
Nice-Awful	Fulton	EH	5.47	0.28		
Nice-Awful	Fulton	Normal	5.81	0.15	(1,43)	1.12 ns
Nice-Awful	Fulton	EMR	5.64	0.23		
Nice-Awful	Gisler	EMR	5.47	0.26	(1,43)	0.25 ns
Nice-Awful	Fulton	EH	5.19	0.19		
Nice-Awful	Gisler	EH	6.02	0.25	(1,13)	6.39 x
Nice-Awful	Gisler	EMR	5.50	0.23		
Nice-Awful	Gisler	Normal	5.77	0.22	(1,43)	0.66 ns
Nice-Awful	Gisler	EH	6.16	0.40		
Nice-Awful	Gisler	Normal	5.58	0.19	(1,29)	1.66 ns
Nice-Awful	Gisler	EMR	5.38	0.27		
Nice-Awful	Gisler	EH	6.39	0.52	(1,23)	2.73 ns
Nice-Awful	Gisler	EMR & EH	5.63	0.21		
	Gisler	Normal	5.68	0.21	(1,49)	0.04 ns
Nice-Awful	Fulton	EMR & EH	5.51	0.16		
Nice-Awful	Fulton	Normal	5.82	0.16	(1,69)	1.78 ns
Nice-Awful	Fulton	EMR & EH	5.52	0.18		
Nice-Awful	Gisler	EMR & EH	5.59	0.21	(1,59)	0.07 ns
Nice-Awful	Fulton & Gisler	EMR	5.47	0.16		
Nice-Awful	Fulton & Gisler	EH	5.79	0.27	(1,59)	1.02 ns

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE NUMBER 9 (CONTINUED)

Subject	School	Student Category	Adj. $\bar{X}$	S.E. Adj. $\bar{X}$	df	F-Ratio
Fair-Unfair	Fulton	EMR	4.96	0.18		
Fair-Unfair	Fulton	EH	5.00	0.29	(1,33)	0.01 ns
Fair-Unfair	Fulton	EMR	5.17	0.19		
Fair-Unfair	Fulton	Normal	5.55	0.16	(1,59)	2.31 ns
Fair-Unfair	Fulton	EH	5.11	0.31		
Fair-Unfair	Fulton	Normal	5.55	0.15	(1,43)	1.63 ns
Fair-Unfair	Fulton	EMR	5.12	0.19		
Fair-Unfair	Gisler	EMR	5.05	0.22	(1,43)	0.05 ns
Fair-Unfair	Fulton	EH	4.82	0.27		
Fair-Unfair	Gisler	EH	4.46	0.35	(1,13)	0.67 ns
Fair-Unfair	Gisler	EMR	5.22	0.25		
Fair-Unfair	Gisler	Normal	5.44	0.22	(1,43)	0.43 ns
Fair-Unfair	Gisler	EH	4.99	0.49		
Fair-Unfair	Gisler	Normal	5.39	0.23	(1,29)	0.51 ns
Fair-Unfair	Gisler	EMR	5.00	0.23		
Fair-Unfair	Gisler	EH	5.01	0.42	(1,23)	0.00 ns
Fair-Unfair	Gisler	EMR & EH	5.13	0.22		
	Gisler	Normal	5.37	0.22	(1,49)	0.60 ns
Fair-Unfair	Fulton	EMR & EH	5.10	0.15		
Fair-Unfair	Fulton	Normal	5.51	0.15	(1,69)	3.23 ns
Fair-Unfair	Fulton	EMR & EH	5.04	0.16		
Fair-Unfair	Gisler	EMR & EH	4.91	0.19	(1,59)	0.28 ns
Fair-Unfair	Fulton & Gisler	EMR	4.97	0.14		
Fair-Unfair	Fulton & Gisler	EH	5.02	0.25	(1,59)	0.03 ns

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE NUMBER 9 (CONTINUED)

Subject	School	Student Category	Adj. $\bar{X}$	S.E. Adj. $\bar{X}$	df	F-Ratio
Happy-Sad	Fulton	EMR	5.18	0.23	(1,33)	0.02 ns
Happy-Sad	Fulton	EH	5.12	0.38		
Happy-Sad	Fulton	EMR	5.20	0.23	(1,59)	0.76 ns
Happy-Sad	Fulton	Normal	5.46	0.19		
Happy-Sad	Fulton	EH	5.01	0.30	(1,43)	0.87 ns
Happy-Sad	Fulton	Normal	5.33	0.16		
Happy-Sad	Fulton	EMR	5.29	0.27	(1,43)	0.00 ns
Happy-Sad	Gisler	EMR	5.27	0.30		
Happy-Sad	Fulton	EH	4.89	0.23	(1,13)	1.29 ns
Happy-Sad	Gisler	EH	5.34	0.31		
Happy-Sad	Gisler	EMR	5.56	0.26	(1,43)	0.24 ns
Happy-Sad	Gisler	Normal	5.53	0.23		
Happy-Sad	Gisler	EH	5.74	0.41	(1,29)	0.15 ns
Happy-Sad	Gisler	Normal	5.56	0.19		
Happy-Sad	Gisler	EMR	5.21	0.31	(1,23)	0.45 ns
Happy-Sad	Gisler	EH	5.63	0.56		
Happy-Sad	Gisler	EMR & EH	5.42	0.23	(1,49)	0.08 ns
	Gisler	Normal	5.51	0.23		
Happy-Sad	Fulton	EMR & EH	5.14	0.18	(1,69)	1.17 ns
Happy-Sad	Fulton	Normal	5.41	0.18		
Happy-Sad	Fulton	EMR & EH	5.20	0.20	(1,59)	0.03 ns
Happy-Sad	Gisler	EMR & EH	5.26	0.24		
Happy-Sad	Fulton & Gisler	EMR	5.18	0.18	(1,59)	0.22 ns
Happy-Sad	Fulton & Gisler	EH	5.35	0.31		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE NUMBER 10

t-TESTS FOR THE SIGNIFICANCE OF PRE AND POST-TEST MEAN DIFFERENCES ON THE STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

School	Student Category	N	$\bar{X}$ dif	S.D.$_{\bar{X}\ dif}$	t
Fulton	EMR	19	.47	8.11	0.25 ns
Fulton	EH	10	- 3.90	6.90	- 1.69 ns
Gisler	EMR	21	.43	7.33	0.26 ns
Gisler	EH	6	- 8.50	5.89	- 3.23 xx
Fulton & Gisler	EMR	40	.45	7.61	0.37 ns
Fulton & Gisler	EH	16	- 5.63	6.74	- 3.24 xx
Fulton	EMR & EH	29	- 1.03	7.88	- 0.69 ns
Gisler	EMR & EH	27	- 1.56	7.89	- 1.01 ns

EMR Students - 57% met criterion

EH Students - 19% met criterion

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE NUMBER 11

t-TESTS FOR THE SIGNIFICANCE OF PRE AND POST-TEST MEAN DIFFERENCES ON THE STICK FIGURE TEST

School	Student Category	N	$\bar{X}$ dif	S.D.$_{\bar{X}\ dif}$	t
Fulton	EMR	19	1.58	7.95	0.85 ns
Fulton	EH	10	- 3.60	5.56	1.94 ns
Gisler	EMR	22	4.18	10.46	1.83 ns
Gisler	EH	5	- 12.20	11.43	- 2.13 ns
Fulton & Gisler	EMR	41	2.98	9.36	2.01 ns
Fulton & Gisler	EH	15	- 6.47	8.65	2.80 x
Fulton	EMR & EH	29	- 0.21	7.54	- 0.15 ns
Gisler	EMR & EH	27	1.15	12.27	0.48 ns

EMR Students - 61% met criterion

EH Students - 20% met criterion

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE NUMBER 12

t-TESTS FOR THE SIGNIFICANCE OF PRE AND POST-TEST MEAN DIFFERENCES ON THE EVALUATIVE SCALE OF THE AUDITORY SELF-CONCEPT MEASURING INSTRUMENT (ASCMI)

School	Student Category	N	$\bar{X}$ dif	S.D.$_{\bar{X}\ dif}$	t
Fulton	EMR	14	- 0.14	2.85	- 0.18 ns
Fulton	EH	7	- 1.57	1.99	- 1.93 ns
Gisler	EMR	19	0.05	3.58	0.06 ns
Gisler	EH	6	0.00	5.40	0.00 ns
Fulton & Gisler	EMR	33	- 0.03	3.25	- 0.05 ns
Fulton & Gisler	EH	13	- 0.85	3.85	- 0.76 ns
Fulton	EMR & EH	21	- 0.62	2.64	- 1.05 ns
Gisler	EMR & EH	25	0.04	3.96	0.05 ns

EMR Students - 55% met criterion

EH Students - 38% met criterion

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE NUMBER 13

t-TESTS FOR THE SIGNIFICANCE OF PRE AND POST-TEST MEAN DIFFERENCES ON THE DYNAMISM SCALE OF THE AUDITORY SELF-CONCEPT MEASURING INSTRUMENT (ASCMI)

School	Student Category	N	$\bar{X}$ dif	S.D.$_{\bar{X}\ dif}$	t
Fulton	EMR	14	1.14	3.28	1.25 ns
Fulton	EH	7	- 0.71	1.98	- 0.88 ns
Gisler	EMR	19	0.26	2.68	0.42 ns
Gisler	EH	6	1.67	3.93	0.95 ns
Fulton & Gisler	EMR	33	0.64	2.93	1.22 ns
Fulton & Gisler	EH	13	0.38	3.15	0.42 ns
Fulton	EMR & EH	21	0.52	2.99	0.78 ns
Gisler	EMR & EH	25	0.60	3.00	0.98 ns

EMR Students - 55% met criterion

EH Students - 69% met criterion

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE NUMBER 14

t-TESTS FOR THE SIGNIFICANCE OF PRE AND POST-TEST MEAN DIFFERENCES ON THE LEVEL OF ASPIRATION TEST

School	Student Category	N	$\bar{X}$ dif	S.D.$_{\bar{X}\ dif}$	t
Fulton	EMR	24	- 0.17	1.13	- 0.71 ns
Fulton	EH	12	- 0.50	0.91	- 1.82 ns
Gisler	EMR	21	- 0.81	1.08	- 3.35 x
Gisler	EH	5	0.00	1.23	0.00 ns
Fulton & Gisler	EMR	45	- 0.47	1.14	- 2.72 x
Fulton & Gisler	EH	17	- 0.35	1.00	- 1.42 ns
Fulton	EMR & EH	36	- 0.28	1.06	- 1.55 ns
Gisler	EMR & EH	26	- 0.65	1.13	- 2.88 x

EMR Students - 49% met criterion

EH Students - 53% met criterion

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE NUMBER 15

F-RATIOS FOR ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE FOR COMPARISONS ON THE POST-TEST STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE ADJUSTED FOR DIFFERENCES ON THE PRE-TEST MEAN

School	Student Category	Adj. $\bar{X}$	S.E. Adj. $\bar{X}$	df	F-Ratio
Fulton	EMR	51.86	1.22	(1,26)	13.95 xx
Fulton	EH	43.87	1.71		
Gisler	EMR	51.50	1.48	(1,24)	5.01 x
Gisler	EH	44.24	2.84		
Fulton & Gisler	EMR	51.51	0.93	(1,53)	16.46 xx
Fulton & Gisler	EH	44.40	1.48		
Fulton	EMR	52.15	1.49	(1,37)	0.17 ns
Gisler	EMR	51.29	1.42		
Fulton	EH	43.85	1.54	(1,13)	0.01 ns
Gisler	EH	44.09	2.05		
Fulton	EMR & EH	49.37	1.26	(1,53)	0.01 ns
Gisler	EMR & EH	49.60	1.30		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE NUMBER 16

F-RATIOS FOR ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE FOR COMPARISONS ON THE POST-TEST STICK FIGURE TEST ADJUSTED FOR DIFFERENCES ON THE PRE-TEST MEAN

School	Student Category	Adj. $\bar{X}$	S.E. Adj. $\bar{X}$	df	F-Ratio
Fulton	EMR	65.73	1.39	(1,26)	6.86 x
Fulton	EH	59.50	1.92		
Gisler	EMR	67.83	1.93	(1,24)	7.07 x
Gisler	EH	55.55	4.14		
Fulton & Gisler	EMR	66.97	1.19	(1,53)	15.68 xx
Fulton & Gisler	EH	57.87	1.97		
Fulton	EMR	65.90	1.80	(1,38)	0.55 ns
Gisler	EMR	67.72	1.67		
Fulton	EH	59.91	2.37	(1,12)	1.50 ns
Gisler	EH	54.57	3.46		
Fulton	EMR & EH	63.73	1.60	(1,53)	0.52 ns
Gisler	EMR & EH	65.40	1.66		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE NUMBER 17

F-RATIOS FOR ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE FOR COMPARISONS ON THE POST-TEST AUDITORY SELF-CONCEPT MEASURING INSTRUMENT (ASCMI) ADJUSTED FOR DIFFERENCES ON THE PRE-TEST MEAN (EVALUATIVE)

School	Student Category	Adj. $\bar{X}$	S.E. Adj. $\bar{X}$	df	F-Ratio
Fulton	EMR	15.99	0.65	(1,18)	0.97 ns
Fulton	EH	14.87	0.92		
Gisler	EMR	15.71	0.53	(1,22)	1.04 ns
Gisler	EH	14.59	0.96		
Fulton & Gisler	EMR	15.79	0.41	(1,43)	1.49 ns
Fulton & Gisler	EH	14.85	0.65		
Fulton	EMR	15.92	0.70	(1,30)	0.06 ns
Gisler	EMR	15.69	0.60		
Fulton	EH	15.06	0.70	(1,10)	0.19 ns
Gisler	EH	14.60	0.76		
Fulton	EMR & EH	15.61	0.53	(1,43)	0.06 ns
Gisler	EMR & EH	15.44	0.48		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE NUMBER 18

F-RATIOS FOR ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE FOR COMPARISONS ON THE POST-TEST AUDITORY SELF-CONCEPT MEASURING INSTRUMENT (ASCMI) ADJUSTED FOR DIFFERENCES ON THE PRE-TEST MEAN (DYNAMISM)

School	Student Category	Adj. $\bar{X}$	S.E. Adj. $\bar{X}$	df	F-Ratio
Fulton	EMR	13.33	0.72	(1,18)	2.54 ns
Fulton	EH	11.35	1.01		
Gisler	EMR	12.28	0.57	(1,22)	0.31 ns
Gisler	EH	12.94	1.03		
Fulton & Gisler	EMR	12.73	0.45	(1,43)	0.58 ns
Fulton & Gisler	EH	12.08	0.72		
Fulton	EMR	13.33	0.70	(1,30)	1.06 ns
Gisler	EMR	12.36	0.60		
Fulton	EH	11.10	0.93	(1,10)	1.68 ns
Gisler	EH	12.88	1.01		
Fulton	EMR & EH	12.61	0.56	(1,43)	0.02 ns
Gisler	EMR & EH	12.49	0.52		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE NUMBER 19

F-RATIOS FOR ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE FOR COMPARISONS ON THE POST-TEST LEVEL OF ASPIRATION TEST ADJUSTED FOR DIFFERENCES ON THE PRE-TEST MEAN

School	Student Category	Adj. $\bar{X}$	S.E. Adj. $\bar{X}$	df	F-Ratio
Fulton	EMR	3.08	0.18	(1,33)	6.15 x
Fulton	EH	2.26	0.26		
Gisler	EMR	2.52	0.17	(1,23)	3.20 ns
Gisler	EH	2.31	0.35		
Fulton & Gisler	EMR	2.82	0.13	(1,59)	1.11 ns
Fulton & Gisler	EH	2.54	0.22		
Fulton	EMR	3.12	0.15	(1,42)	7.76 xx
Gisler	EMR	2.52	0.16		
Fulton	EH	2.27	0.29	(1,14)	1.57 ns
Gisler	EH	2.95	0.45		
Fulton	EMR & EH	2.83	0.15	(1,59)	0.82 ns
Gisler	EMR & EH	2.62	0.18		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE NUMBER 20

DIFFERENCES IN MEAN PERFORMANCE ON THE STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE DURING A TWO YEAR PERIOD FOR STUDENTS ENROLLED IN THE PROGRAM

Year	Student Category	N	Pre-Mean	Post-Mean
1970	EMR	42	47.52	52.38
1970	EH	12	47.75	48.08
1971	EMR	40	51.25	51.70
1971	EH	16	49.56	43.94

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE NUMBER 21

DIFFERENCES IN MEAN PERFORMANCE ON THE STICK FIGURE TEST DURING A TWO YEAR PERIOD FOR STUDENTS ENROLLED IN THE PROGRAM

Year	Student Category	N	Pre-Mean	Post-Mean
1970	EMR	46	64.93	65.38
1970	EH	21	62.90	64.29
1971	EMR	41	63.90	66.88
1971	EH	15	64.60	58.13

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE NUMBER 22

DIFFERENCES IN MEAN PERFORMANCE ON THE EVALUATIVE AND DYNAMISM SCALE OF THE AUDITORY SELF-CONCEPT MEASURING INSTRUMENT (ASCMI) DURING A THREE YEAR PERIOD FOR STUDENTS ENROLLED IN THE PROGRAM

Year	Scale	Student Category	N	Pre-Mean	Post-Mean
1969	Evaluative	EMR	15	13.80	15.30
1969	Evaluative	EH	12	15.17	16.58
1969	Dynamism	EMR	15	12.20	11.67
1969	Dynamism	EH	12	12.25	12.92
1970	Evaluative	EMR	45	15.27	15.54
1970	Evaluative	EH	20	15.20	16.33
1970	Dynamism	EMR	45	12.38	11.67
1970	Dynamism	EH	20	12.60	12.47
1971	Evaluative	EMR	33	15.82	15.79
1971	Evaluative	EH	13	15.69	14.85
1971	Dynamism	EMR	33	12.15	12.79
1971	Dynamism	EH	13	11.54	11.92

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE NUMBER 23

DIFFERENCES IN MEAN PERFORMANCE ON THE LEVEL OF ASPIRATION TEST DURING A TWO YEAR PERIOD FOR STUDENTS ENROLLED IN THE PROGRAM

Year	Student Category	N	Pre-Mean	Post-Mean
1970	EMR	46	4.1	4.1
1970	EH	20	3.9	4.0
1971	EMR	45	3.3	2.8
1971	EH	17	2.8	2.5

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(INDIVIDUAL CASES)

ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT FOR STUDENTS ENROLLED IN THE PROGRAM--EDUCABLE MENTALLY RETARDED

I.D. No.	Reading Scores Pre 9/71	Reading Scores Post 5/72	Expected Gain	Actual Gain	Met Expected Growth Y = Yes N = No	Arithmetic Scores Pre 9/71	Arithmetic Scores Post 5/72	Expected Gain	Actual Gain	Met Expected Growth Y = Yes N = No	Criterion % Reading	Criterion % Arithmetic
783	P.1	1.2	0.0	2.1	Y	K.2	1.2	0.1	1.0	Y	94%	100%
785	1.3	2.3	0.7	1.0	Y	1.4	2.8	0.7	1.4	Y	92%	100%
784	1.5	2.1	0.5	0.6	Y	1.6	2.8	0.5	1.2	Y	100%	100%
718	2.4	4.1	0.8	1.7	Y	2.2	3.9	0.7	1.7	Y	100%	92%
744	2.2	4.4	0.5	2.2	Y	2.2	3.2	0.5	1.0	Y	94%	80%
786	P.9	1.4	0.0	1.5	Y	1.9	2.8	0.4	0.9	Y	96%	96%
728	1.5	1.9	0.4	0.4	Y	1.4	3.0	0.3	1.6	Y	92%	92%
729	1.6	2.0	0.4	0.4	Y	1.4	2.8	0.3	1.4	Y	92%	100%
745	2.3	1.7	0.6	-0.6	N	2.4	4.2	0.6	1.8	Y	88%	100%
787	2.3	2.8	0.6	0.5	N	2.1	4.5	0.6	2.4	Y	100%	88%
806		3.1					4.5				93%	97%
805		1.5					2.8				100%	97%
789	2.0	2.3	0.4	0.3	N	2.2	2.6	0.4	0.4	Y	92%	100%
717	K.8	1.3	0.1	0.5	Y	1.2	2.8	0.2	1.6	Y	100%	100%
788	1.9					2.6						
732	1.9	2.0	0.3	0.1	N	1.9	3.2	0.5	1.3	Y	96%	97%
807		3.6					4.2				100%	100%
790	2.7	3.9	0.5	1.2	Y	3.0	4.5	0.5	1.5	Y	100%	100%
730	2.8	3.6	0.4	0.8	Y	3.2	4.2	0.5	1.0	Y	90%	
735	2.3	3.1	0.5	0.8	Y	3.2	5.2	0.6	2.0	Y	100%	92%

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Academic Achievement (Individual Cases)
EMR (Continued)

I.D. No.	Reading Scores Pre 9/71	Reading Scores Post 5/72	Expected Gain	Actual Gain	Met Expected Growth Y = Yes N = No	Arithmetic Scores Pre 9/71	Arithmetic Scores Post 5/72	Expected Gain	Actual Gain	Met Expected Growth Y = Yes N = No	Criterion % Reading	Criterion % Arithmetic
714	K.2	1.2	0.1	1.0	Y	K.7	2.8	0.1	2.1	Y	100%	100%
749		2.5					4.2				100%	96%
269	3.3	3.8	0.4	0.5	Y	3.9	4.5	0.4	0.6	Y	100%	80%
791	3.0	3.8	0.4	0.8	Y	3.6	4.2	0.5	0.6	Y	92%	80%
443	2.2	2.5	0.3	0.3	Y	3.6	3.9	0.5	0.3	N	94%	52%
792	2.9	3.5	0.4	0.6	Y	3.6	4.5	0.5	0.9	Y	92%	96%
079	2.6		0.3			3.2		0.4			92%	68%
741	4.7	5.9	0.5	1.2	Y	2.8	3.2	0.3	0.4	Y	92%	68%
770	P.2					K.3						
771	1.1	2.0	1.1	0.9	N	1.2	2.8	1.2	1.6	Y	92%	92%
798		1.3					2.1					92%
773	K.9	1.3	0.5	0.4	N	1.0	2.2	0.5	1.2	Y		88%
754	1.4	2.0	0.5	0.6	Y	2.4	3.0	0.8	0.6	N	97%	92%
772	1.2	2.1	0.2	0.9	Y	1.2	2.8	0.2	1.6	Y	97%	92%
799		1.9					3.2				97%	96%
756	1.9	2.7	0.6	0.8	Y	3.2	4.2	1.1	1.0	N	100%	92%
719	1.2	2.2	0.2	1.0	Y	1.9	3.2	0.4	1.3	Y	97%	96%
724	2.0					3.2						
774	1.3	2.5	0.4	1.2	Y		3.2				100%	92%
758	4.5	7.5	0.7	3.0	Y	2.4	4.2	0.4	1.8	Y	100%	88%

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Academic Achievement (Individual Cases)
EMR (Continued)

I.D. No.	Reading Scores Pre 9/71	Reading Scores Post 5/72	Expected Gain	Actual Gain	Met Expected Growth Y = Yes N = No	Arithmetic Scores Pre 9/71	Arithmetic Scores Post 5/72	Expected Gain	Actual Gain	Met Expected Growth Y = Yes N = No	Criterion % Reading	Criterion % Arithmetic
731	2.3	2.8	0.5	0.5	Y	1.9	2.6	0.4	0.7	Y	97%	88%
738	1.6	2.3	0.5	0.7	Y	1.0	2.1	0.3	1.1	Y	91%	100%
800		2.2									100%	80%
775	K.4					1.6						
723	2.4	3.0	0.3	0.6	Y	2.8	3.6	0.4	0.8	Y	95%	96%
734	2.1	2.6	0.4	0.5	Y	3.6	4.5	0.7	0.9	Y	85%	76%
737	1.9	3.3	0.4	1.4	Y	2.4	3.9	0.5	1.5	Y		88%
536	5.1	6.5	0.9	1.4	Y	2.4	3.2	0.4	0.8	Y	96%	80%
739	2.3	3.0	0.3	0.7	Y	2.8	3.6	0.4	0.8	Y	76%	96%
733	5.1	7.5	0.6	2.4	Y	3.9	4.2	0.5	0.3	N	90%	76%
746	3.8	5.1	0.6	1.3	Y	3.9	4.7	0.7	0.8	Y	90%	83-1/3%
740	1.6	2.1	0.3	0.5	Y	1.6	2.4	0.3	0.8	Y	94%	92%
776	1.8	3.0	0.3	1.2	Y	2.8	4.7	0.4	1.9	Y	100%	100%
801		2.1					3.6					
748	5.5	6.1	0.7	0.6	N	2.8	3.9	0.3	1.1	Y	98%	80%
747	3.8	5.5	0.5	1.7	Y	4.5	5.5	0.6	1.0	Y	98%	96-2/3%
113	1.6					4.5						
722	4.2	4.8	0.5	0.6	Y	3.6	5.3	0.5	1.7	Y	91-3/7%	93-1/3%

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(INDIVIDUAL CASES)

ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT FOR STUDENTS ENROLLED IN THE PROGRAM--EDUCATIONALLY HANDICAPPED

I.D. No.	Reading Scores Pre 9/71	Reading Scores Post 5/72	Expected Gain	Actual Gain	Met Expected Growth Y = Yes N = No	Arithmetic Scores Pre 9/71	Arithmetic Scores Post 5/72	Expected Gain	Actual Gain	Met Expected Growth Y = Yes N = No	Criterion % Reading	Criterion % Arithmetic
808		K.4					1.8				76%	100%
149	2.8	4.2	0.9	1.4	Y	1.8	3.0	0.6	1.2	Y	100%	92%
793	3.0	4.5	0.7	1.5	Y	2.2	5.2	0.5	3.0	Y		
512	K.6	1.4	0.1	0.8	Y	2.1	3.2	0.5	1.1	Y	99%	98%
809		3.9					4.5				100%	85%
794	3.8	4.4	0.8	0.6	N	4.5	5.5	0.9	1.0	Y	90%	45%
810		3.3					5.5				90%	96%
797	3.1	4.4	0.6	1.3	Y	3.9	5.0	0.8	1.1	Y	80%	100%
796	3.6	5.3	0.6	1.7	Y	4.5	5.3	0.7	0.8	Y		
513	4.5	5.3	0.7	0.8	Y	4.7	5.7	0.8	1.0	Y	96%	88%
795	4.7	7.2	0.7	2.5	Y	4.5	5.5	0.6	1.0	Y	88%	57%
548	5.9	6.5	1.2	0.6	N	3.9	5.5	0.8	1.6	Y	80%	70%
170	7.2	6.3	1.1	-0.9	N	5.2	5.3	0.7	0.1	N		
278	6.1	7.1	0.9	1.0	Y	4.7	5.9	0.7	1.2	Y	92%	75%
573	11.3	11.7	1.4	0.4	N	3.9	5.5	0.5	1.6	Y	96%	54%
777	1.3					2.1						
761	1.4	1.7	0.7	0.3	N	2.6	2.8	1.3	0.2	N	93%	92%
779	1.4					2.4						
778	1.5					2.2						
802		2.5					3.2					

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Academic Achievement (Individual Cases)
EH (Continued)

I.D. No.	Reading Scores Pre 9/71	Reading Scores Post 5/72	Expected Gain	Actual Gain	Met Expected Growth Y = Yes N = No	Arithmetic Scores Pre 9/71	Arithmetic Scores Post 5/72	Expected Gain	Actual Gain	Met Expected Growth Y = Yes N = No	Criterion % Reading	Criterion % Arithmetic
310	1.9	4.1	0.5	2.2	Y	2.8	4.7	0.7	1.9	Y	98%	84%
780	2.5					2.8						
803		2.3					4.5				100%	80%
274	1.5	2.1	0.3	0.6	Y	3.0	4.7	0.6	1.7	Y	86%	84%
413	2.4	4.1	0.5	1.7	Y	3.9	5.2	0.8	1.3	Y	98%	76%
781	2.5											
782	4.1	6.5	0.7	2.4	Y	4.7	5.2	0.8	0.5	N	83%	88%
464	2.0	2.8	0.4	0.8	Y	4.2	5.3	0.8	1.1	Y	100%	96%
413	4.7	5.4	0.5	0.7	Y	4.5	5.3	0.8	0.8	Y	96%	92%